DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 067 RC 020 764

AUTHOR Castleman, Jacquelyn B.
TITLE Improving Field Experiences for Rural Preservice Teachers through the Establishment of a Professional Development School.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 91p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Cooperative Programs; Educational Improvement; Higher Education; Primary Education; Professional Development; *Professional Development Schools; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Rural Schools; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

This practicum reports on the creation of a professional development school (PDS) designed to improve field experiences for early childhood education majors at a rural private college. The goal of the project was to increase the number of qualified teachers at a local primary school who would be willing to participate in the supervision of student teachers. The initial step in establishing the PDS was the formation of a steering committee composed of teachers, an administrator, and other school personnel. The steering committee met weekly and collaborated in writing the mission statement and goals for the PDS, identified staff development needs, sponsored staff workshops, and addressed specific areas of teacher concern. In addition, the role of the author as program developer included establishing rapport with all school personnel, encouraging open communication among participants, promoting a willingness to assist teachers with classroom concerns, providing resources for teachers, and acting as a liaison between the college and the school. Program evaluation revealed that most PDS participants were positive about the partnership between the college and the school, that participation rates were high for steering committee meetings and functions, that there was an increase in the number of teachers willing to supervise students teachers, and that student teachers were able to be placed in a quality field experience that was in close proximity to the college campus. However, a majority of the teachers did not complete a state-recommended course for student-teacher supervisors designed to improve their teaching skills as well as their proficiency as supervisors. Appendix includes teacher survey, evaluation forms, and PDS mission statement and goals. (LP)

ED 401 067

Improving Field Experiences for Rural Preservice Teachers Through the Establishment of a Professional Development School

by

Jacquelyn B. Castleman

Cluster 61

A Practicum II Report Presented to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jacquelyn B. Castleman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC 020764

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Kathryn L. Garrard
Kathryn L. Garrard, Ed.D.

Division Chairperson, Education Division
Title

Brewton-Parker College
Mt. Vernon, GA 30445

July 8, 1996
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Jacquelyn B. Castleman under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Approved:

August 7, 1996
Date of Final Approval of Report

Mary Ellen Sapp
Mary Ellen Sapp, Ph.D., Adviser

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this magnitude can never be accomplished through the efforts of a single individual. Many people have contributed to see this practicum implementation reach its successful completion. Most important in this endeavor were the administrators, faculty, and staff at the primary school. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to these people for accepting me as one of their own. A special word of thanks goes to the steering committee members for the many hours they spent poring over issues and making decisions concerning the professional development school project.

Friends and colleagues have offered their encouragement and support during this entire process. My sincere appreciation goes to Nova clustermates and friends: Melba Claxton, Johnette Gunter, and Craig Dunn. My special friends, Jeanette Goff and Ann Villella, have been waiting patiently for me and have supported all my efforts.

My adviser, Dr. Mary Ellen Sapp, has urged me to see beyond the obvious and to look for the possible. Her insight and suggestions were priceless to me and were necessary for successful completion of this practicum.

My deepest love and appreciation are extended to my husband, James Castleman; to my children, Jim Castleman and Julie and Jason Riddle; and to my special little angel, Logan. God bless you all! We made it!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		iv
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Description of Community	1
	Writer's Work Setting and Role	2
II	STUDY OF THE PROBLEM	6
	Problem Description	6
	Problem Documentation	6
	Causative Analysis	7
	Relationship of the Problem to the Literature	11
III	ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	23
	Goals and Expectations	23
	Expected Outcomes	23
	Measurement of Outcomes	23
IV	SOLUTION STRATEGY	27
	Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions	27
	Description of Selected Solution	35
	Report of Action Taken	38
V	RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	50
	Results	51
	Discussion	55
	Recommendations	64
	Dissemination	66
REFERENCES		68

Appendices Page

A SURVEY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS..... 52

B EVALUATION OF COOPERATING TEACHER..... 54

C EVALUATION OF SUPERVISING TEACHER..... 58

D PDS MISSION STATEMENT AND GOALS..... 82

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Teachers Involved in Field Experiences..... 54

2 Proximity of Field Placements to College Campus 55

ABSTRACT

Improving Field Experiences for Rural Preservice Teachers Through the Establishment of a Professional Development School. Castleman, Jacquelyn B., 1996: Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Professional Development School/College and School Partnership/Collaboration Between Colleges and Schools/Preservice Teachers/Field Experiences

This practicum was designed to improve field experiences for early childhood education majors enrolled in a rural private college. The writer accomplished this through the establishment of a professional development school (PDS) for the college at a nearby primary school.

A cadre of teachers composed of two teachers from each grade level (preK-2), one administrator, the media specialist, and the writer served as a steering committee. This committee was responsible for laying the foundation for the PDS and began its work by writing the mission statement and goals for the project. The grade representatives acted as liaisons between their teachers and the committee; all proposals from the committee were presented to the entire faculty before any action was taken. In addition to writing the mission statement and goals, the steering committee sponsored staff development workshops and rewrote the school's handbook and discipline policy.

Analysis of the data revealed that all participants in the project asserted that the project was a success. Steering committee members, cooperating teachers, and preservice teachers made positive comments about the partnership and about field experiences. The number of cooperating teachers at the school increased from previous years, and student placements were closer in proximity to the college campus, thus making them more convenient for students and college supervisors.

****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (X) do not ( ) give permission to Nova Southeastern University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova Southeastern University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

July 8, 1996

Jacquelyn B. Castleman

vi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Community

The setting for this practicum is a community located in the southeastern region of the United States and in a typically agrarian area of the state; however, this particular community has a much larger concentration of people and industries than any towns in the neighboring counties. During the last 10-15 years, as a result of becoming the hub of industry and trade for the area and of becoming the home for people from various cultures, the community's defining characteristics have changed from being a sleepy, slow-moving southern town to being a small town with big-city panache.

Becoming the center of industry and trade has had both positive and negative effects for this town of 11,250. Area businesses have brought in personnel from cities throughout the nation. These people have become acculturated rapidly to the lifestyle of the south and have become active members of the community. As a result of combining the nouveau southerners' knowledge and efforts with that of the native townspeople, a variety of enriching cultural events has been initiated. These events attract people from an extensive area and provide quality entertainment for all, regardless of their preference in the arts.

Everything is not pleasant in this small town, however, for many of the problems of more urban areas are evident here. Bachtel & Boatright (1994) gave the following staggering county statistics: 41.0% of students never complete high school; the county ranks 15th out of 159 counties in the number of juvenile commitments and institutionalizations, with 2,792 juveniles considered at risk for problems with the law; the total number of state prison inmates from the county has increased 78.4% since 1989; 43.6% of all live births are to unwed mothers; reported child abuse cases have risen 244.7% between 1983 and 1992; and 24.0% of the population live below the poverty level (49.4% of all Blacks and 15.0% of all Whites). The urban problems of illegal drugs, high school dropouts, juvenile and adult crime, single parent families, child abuse, and poverty have become real problems in this rural community.

Writer's Work Setting and Roles

Although county statistics for education are not encouraging, the primary school where the practicum was implemented is part of a city system that has earned an excellent reputation in state education circles. As a matter of fact, the system has been recognized as one of the top 35 in the state on standardized test scores, three of four schools are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and one of four schools has been named

a School of Excellence. The primary school (Grades PreK-2) has an enrollment of 646 students. The staff includes 34 teachers and two administrators, as well as 20 support staff members and five certificated personnel in speech, physical education, special education, and media. In addition to the regular faculty and staff, a local parent volunteer organization, Friends of the School, provides extra help for teachers through contributing much-needed tutoring, clerical help, and other forms of assistance as requested by the teachers and school administrators. The writer was at the school several days each week and the school provided her with an office and with meeting space for activities that occurred during the practicum.

Although the practicum implementation took place at the primary school, out of necessity some time was spent at the writer's workplace. The 4-year, private, liberal arts college is located approximately 15 miles from the primary school. The director of professional lab experiences required all student teachers to attend weekly seminars in the education building on campus. The purposes of these meetings were for dissemination of information and for the student teachers to share classroom experiences and problems that they encountered. During these weekly sessions, the writer also met with her students in a small group setting to discuss matters of importance to them.

The practicum experience involved a number of

different people. Besides the writer, the education division chairperson and at least one other education colleague were on site occasionally at the primary school during the implementation phase. In addition, steering committee members (composed of six teachers, two from each grade level K-4; at least one school administrator; the school media specialist; and the writer), cooperating teachers, student teachers, practicum students, students, and administrators were part of the process. The number of participants varied, depending upon quarterly student enrollment.

The writer is a college professor. During the 1995-1996 academic year, in addition to teaching her specialty courses, General Curriculum and General Methods for Early Childhood, she taught two new courses, Social Studies Methods for Early Childhood and Language Arts Methods for Early Childhood. The writer also functioned as the principal college supervisor for student teachers each quarter and, during this practicum, supervised students at the primary school, several middle schools, and a high school. She served as the official on-site liaison from the college to the primary school during the practicum implementation.

In addition to teaching and supervision, the writer fulfilled a number of other roles on campus during the implementation period. She served as division coordinator

for the early childhood program and was involved in organizing and beginning a self-study for reapproval of the teacher education program by the state Professional Standards Commission and for initial accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). For the past 7 years, the writer has served on the Professional Program Committee, the committee which is responsible for establishing entrance requirements to the teacher education program and for screening and monitoring teacher candidates throughout their college career. The Academic Dean of the college appointed her chairperson of that committee for the 1995-1996 academic year; with this appointment came increased responsibility and time demands. In addition, the writer was elected to a 4-year term (1995-1999) as treasurer for the state chapter of the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE).

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

The shortage of teachers in this geographical area and at the primary school who are certified to supervise student teachers or who are willing to supervise student teachers was a problem. Because of this problem some preservice teachers have endured inadequate and frustrating student teaching experiences. In addition, the insufficient supply of local cooperating teachers has caused student teachers and college supervising teachers to travel many miles, wasting precious hours in transit and causing excessive travel expenditures for students and the college.

Problem Documentation

Several sources supported the fact that many of the primary school teachers were not formally prepared to or were not willing to act as cooperating teachers. When the education division of the college conducted a survey regarding field placements of preservice teachers (see Appendix A), only 21 of 39 of the primary teachers responded. This indicated to the writer that a pervasive sense of indifference toward the supervision of preservice teachers from the college existed in the school.

Although 15 of the 21 respondents had previous

experience supervising practicum students from methods classes, only nine of the 21 indicated they had ever supervised a student teacher from the college. These results included a time period from Fall Quarter 1987 through Spring Quarter 1995. Only 4 of the 9 teachers who had served in the capacity of cooperating teacher indicated that they had received staff development in the supervision and support of preservice teachers.

Other sources provided evidence that the problem existed. School administrators told the writer that some of their best teachers did not want to supervise preservice teachers. In addition, during her 7 years as a college supervisor, the writer consistently observed that some of the most respected and effective teachers never participated in the supervision of the college's student teachers. College placement records confirmed these facts: (a) at each school site a small core of teachers was used to supervise preservice teachers, and (b) field placements were sometimes as distant as 50 miles from the campus.

Causative Analysis

The problem of a scarcity of willing, qualified cooperating teachers may have been caused by several factors. These included teacher isolation and insecurities, teacher attitudes toward their own field experiences, teacher suspicions regarding preservice teachers' motives, school administrators, inadequate collaboration between the

school and the college, and the attempt by the college to spread preservice teachers equally throughout the service area.

The historical isolationism experienced by most teachers has been a tremendous deterrent to improving teaching and to providing quality field experiences for preservice teachers. Through the years, this writer has observed that most teachers teach behind closed doors and rarely confer with other teachers. According to Darling-Hammond (1990), the structure of American classrooms and the grouping of students and teachers promote this isolationism and prevent the emergence of professional standards since little time is allowed for anything besides instructing students.

Maeroff (1993) described the problem of professional isolation as a "curse familiar to most teachers" (p.6). He further stated that teachers have no idea what is being done in classrooms next to theirs except through the hearsay of others. This same isolationism, according to Darling-Hammond (1990), promotes individualism and idiosyncratic teaching practices. The writer often observed professional isolation in the schools where she supervised student teachers. The only contact most teachers had with other teachers was during lunch period; during school faculty meetings; or during much-despised, administrator-planned staff development. The writer

believed that this imposed isolation and the resulting individualism felt by most teachers contributed to the reluctance of teachers to share their room with another person.

In addition to isolationism, several other teacher concerns may have caused the problem. First of all, some teachers feel insecure regarding methodology and/or classroom management and discipline. As a result of this timidity, they may not feel comfortable mentoring preservice teachers. Some of the writer's former students have expressed the desire to function as cooperating teachers, but they also expressed the fear that they would be unable to show a student teacher what he needed to see. This is not a new problem. In his book on student teaching, Andrews (1964) related that first-time cooperating teachers' most frequent question is "What is expected of me?" (p. 57). The writer believed that these feelings of insecurity and feelings of not being proficient enough caused teachers to be reluctant to act as cooperating teachers for the college's student teachers.

Besides their insecurities regarding methodology and management, some teachers may have had dubious feelings toward supervising student teachers because of their own negative student teaching experience. Although the writer has seen cooperating teachers use these personal incidents as incentives to provide their student teachers with

wonderful experiences, many veteran teachers who had poor student teaching ordeals did not want to take the chance of imposing the same negative experience on a student teacher.

Another contributor to the problem, which may be unique to this area, was the suspicious attitude that prevailed among some inservice teachers. Older veteran teachers, even the very excellent ones, were sometimes wary about having students in their classrooms for any reason and were particularly apprehensive about having students who observe and take notes. Although college supervisors have attempted to alleviate these suspicions, these same teachers never volunteered for student teachers.

Several administrative issues also may have affected the problem of quality placements for student teachers. First of all, public school administrators who were responsible for student teacher placements asked for volunteers who were willing to supervise student teachers. Volunteers were not always the most qualified supervisors. When they did not have sufficient volunteers, administrators approached selected teachers about assuming the responsibility. As shown by the survey results and school placement records, the same teachers at the primary school were utilized repeatedly in this role.

Another administrative cause for the problem nationwide, and one which was well-documented in the literature, was inadequate collaboration between the college

and school. Although the college has enjoyed a collegial relationship with the primary school since the inception of its education program in 1987, no structured form of collaboration had taken place. This lack of meaningful collaboration led to the situation where, during some quarters, the college's need for cooperating teachers extended beyond the school's ability to provide adequately prepared cooperating teachers.

The writer believed that there was more than one cause for the problem of inadequate numbers of qualified, willing cooperating teachers. She believed that several factors contributed to the problem including (a) teacher isolation, insecurities, and suspicions; (b) teachers' negative experiences during their student teaching internship; (c) placement practices of school administrators; and (d) inadequate collaboration between the school and college.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

The literature is replete with information regarding the need for improvement in teacher education, especially in the area of field experiences. Books, professional journal articles, research reports, and information articles have been written about the importance of early and good field experiences for preservice teachers.

Goodlad (1984) stressed the importance of preservice teachers' having high quality internship experiences. He declared that the practice of assigning students to

classroom teachers is not to be taken lightly and that educators are acting foolishly when they expect education to improve while still placing students in classrooms with poor teachers who are reluctant to change.

Allison (1988) and Howe (1993) stressed the importance of improving field experiences and of giving preservice teachers more opportunities to experience the actual classroom. Allison, writing from the physical education perspective, alluded to the fact that many preservice teachers are left to use observational strategies at their own discretion and that this practice often leads to an aimless experience. She stressed the importance of providing structure for field experiences and of giving guidance to the preservice teacher. Howe emphasized the fact that, too often, student teachers are made passive observers instead of active learners. He concluded that preservice teachers need more "hands-on" experience in order to master the art of teaching.

McDermott, Gormley, Rothenberg, and Hammer (1995) concurred with Howe regarding the need for actual classroom experience. They found that improving classroom practica experiences is imperative for helping novice teachers to grow in pedagogical skill and for allowing them to advance in skills at a swifter pace. Their study revealed that students who had varied and extensive experiences along with constructive feedback from supervisors were more able to

reflect maturely about their teaching and about the way children learn.

The literature reveals several causes for the inadequate and unsatisfactory field experiences of preservice teachers. Goodlad (1990b) suggested that preservice and novice teachers are placed under the guidance and tutelage of teachers who engage in poor teaching and management practices; therefore, the problem of poor teaching is perpetuated. The writer has seen this occur many times during her 7-year tenure as college supervisor. In fact, some teachers have declared that their student teachers knew more than they did about teaching a subject, yet they were reluctant to allow the student teacher to utilize new pedagogy in teaching the subject.

Meade (1991) gave several reasons for poor field experiences. First of all, college faculty members who serve as supervisors of student teachers are overloaded with other responsibilities. Most supervisors teach courses and travel as well as fulfill committee assignments. Meade contended that most receive little recognition or career advancement because of their work with student teachers. The writer has found these facts to be true. College supervisors at her small liberal arts college have been overburdened with responsibilities for teaching classes, for supervising student teachers, for being present at all division and school-wide faculty meetings, for chairing

committees and task forces, and for fulfilling obligations to attend all social events at the college. Overworked, underpaid, and unrecognized these frazzled teacher educators have found it difficult to supervise student teachers well and still fulfill all of their other responsibilities.

According to Meade (1991) another reason for poor field experiences is that college supervisors are responsible for too many student interns. Meade contended that supervisors spend more time in transit than they spend with the student teachers for whom they are responsible. College supervisors at the writer's college spent much time in transit. Many students were placed 50 miles or more from the college, causing the supervisor to spend at least 2 hours in transit and only 1 hour with the student teacher. Multiply this transit time by the number of interns and one can see that much precious time was wasted in traveling.

An additional reason given by Meade (1991) for poor quality field experiences is the low status afforded student teacher supervisors. Because of this, accepting supervising responsibilities is not attractive to many qualified professors. As a result, many times the responsibility for supervising field experiences has been relegated to adjunct professors or graduate students.

Meade (1991) further contended that cooperating teachers have a definite effect on field experiences. Many have not had adequate preparation for supervising students,

some who volunteer do so out of ulterior motives, and supervising assignments are sometimes made in a perfunctory manner by administrators. Darling-Hammond and Goodwin (1993) related that the practice of placing students in certain classrooms strictly for convenience results in "haphazard and idiosyncratic student teaching experiences" (p. 33). Meade (1991) and Darling-Hammond and Goodwin (1993) have reiterated what this writer contended: Volunteering often has been the sole criteria for choosing supervising teachers and administrators arbitrarily assigned teachers because it was "their turn" or because they were "good teachers" (Meade, p. 668).

Two sources (Winitzky, Stoddart, & O'Keefe, 1992; Wise, 1991) declared that some supervising teachers are not well-versed in new methods of pedagogy. Closing the chasm between what is learned in the college classroom and what is demonstrated by veteran teachers is one of the most challenging dilemmas faced by colleges of education and public schools (Winitzky, et al.). Goodlad (1990a) declared that this chasm produces a discontinuity in the student teacher's experience and occurs because the norms of practice in school districts are different from what the student teacher has learned. The writer has encountered this problem in classrooms throughout this area. In their methods classes, students learned about techniques such as cooperative learning, math manipulatives, hands-on science,

and the integrated curriculum; however, when they were placed for field experiences most of what they saw was teacher- and textbook-dominated classrooms. According to Goodlad, when students observe this discrepancy but also see that certain techniques work for the cooperating teacher, especially in survival situations, they tend to incorporate the methods with little thought of why they work and with little thought about possible alternatives.

Zeichner (1992) gave several structural barriers to effective teacher learning during the practicum experience. These are (a) placement in a single classroom, (b) inequitable supervision, and (c) lack of multicultural placements. Zeichner contended that placement in a single classroom reinforces the concept of teaching as a solitary activity. Goodlad (1990b) further contended that student teachers need to be exposed to the entire school in order to understand the full scope of their responsibilities, to understand school problems, and to begin their career with the desire to solve these problems. According to these authors, placement in a single classroom is detrimental to the student teacher's development.

Zeichner (1992) and Richardson-Koehler (1988) concluded that inequitable supervision is a definite barrier to effective student teacher learning. Zeichner contended that the failure of cooperating teachers to help student teachers examine their beliefs and assumptions about teaching

reinforces and strengthens the student teachers' current perspectives and keeps them from establishing a good foundation for future learning. Richardson-Koehler further contended that the cooperating teachers' inability and unwillingness to reflect on their own and the student teachers' classroom practices result in inadequate feedback being given to student teachers. The lack of quality feedback, according to Richardson-Koehler, causes the student teachers to become frustrated and confused. This writer has seen the same problems occur many times during the past 7 years. In classrooms where teachers were willing to give feedback and were reflective practitioners, student teachers felt confident and were usually very successful; conversely, in classrooms like those described by Zeichner and Richardson-Koehler, student teachers were stifled and unable to determine how or what the cooperating teacher thought or believed.

In addition to placement in a single classroom and inequitable supervision, Zeichner (1992) reported another barrier to student teacher learning. He declared that many teacher education students do not have culturally diverse backgrounds and that many education programs do not prepare students to teach in economically and culturally diverse situations. As a result, many are lacking the skills needed to work in today's intercultural and interracial classrooms. In the writer's area, however, this has not been a barrier

to quality field experiences. The school districts in the area normally have only one school for each of the certification levels: early childhood/elementary, middle school, and high school; therefore, the population of each school is representative of all subpopulations in the community.

Several writers alluded to the fact that the bureaucratic set-up in schools encourages isolationism of teachers and impedes their professional growth. Both of these affect their ability to function as qualified supervisors of student teachers. According to Darling-Hammond (1994), school districts spend less than one half of 1% of their total budget on teacher development as compared to the nearly 10% spent by businesses. The money that is allocated is spent on "inservicing" which is designed by those in higher authority to ensure that teachers implement prescribed teaching practices and curricula. Barth (1990) contended that these mandated staff development sessions "insult the capable and leave the incompetent untouched" (p. 50). This has been a common problem throughout the college's service area. Someone at the central office would discover a fantastic new curriculum, teaching technique, or discipline strategy and, before long, teachers were "inserviced." Once the sessions were over, it was just as Barth contended: The capable were insulted and the incompetent remained untouched. Nothing

changed.

Darling-Hammond (1989,1994) stated that mandated staff development also portrays teachers as needing little professional knowledge and as having almost no reason for consultation and planning with their colleagues. They are seen as conduits through which the directives of those in authority pass. Goodlad (1984), Howe (1993), and Maeroff (1988), concurred with Darling-Hammond regarding teachers' lack of communication and collaboration with their peers and further stated that the patterns which have been established in schools have left these educators without support, isolated, and powerless. Furthermore, Darling-Hammond and Goodwin (1993) concurred by stating that teachers have very little input in decisions that are made and, therefore, are kept powerless by the bureaucratic structure of public schools.

In addition to all of the recent studies and causes of the problem cited earlier, the literature provided evidence that, historically, poor collaboration between colleges and schools has contributed to the inadequate preparation of preservice teachers. According to Clark (1988), over a century ago the Committee of Ten recommended closer collaboration between university faculty and school personnel, urging the colleges to become more involved in the improvement of all levels of public schooling. Lab schools, based on Dewey's concepts, were established next

and reached their peak in the 1960s (Winitzky, Stoddart, & O'Keefe, 1992). The lab schools never fulfilled Dewey's intended purpose as research sites; instead, they served strictly as preparation sites for new teachers and for the education of children. As the demands for student teaching sites increased, the capacity of the lab schools to meet the demands was surpassed. It was at this time, according to Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe, that the short-lived portal school emerged in the 1970s. Again, this was an attempt to increase collaboration between colleges and schools; however, by the 1980s the portal schools had disappeared. Even after all these attempts were made, collaboration between colleges and schools remained essentially the same.

In 1986 two reports were published that jolted the world of academia and launched American education into its current age of reform/restructuring. The Holmes Group (1986)--at that time consisting of 39 deans of schools and colleges of education at the nation's leading universities--published its report, Tomorrow's Teachers, which focuses on the improvement of teacher education. Among the five major goals in the report, goal four stresses the importance of uniting schools of education and public schools in a collaborative effort to improve the education of teachers. A few months later, the Carnegie Task Force (1986) published a report entitled A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. This report focuses less on teacher education and

more on reforming the entire profession of teaching. The report recommends that educators should rely heavily on the wisdom of classroom teachers as a source of information on knowledge and practice of good teaching. The Holmes and Carnegie reports reiterate the need for closer collaboration between schools of education and public schools in an effort to improve teacher education.

Additional sources reported on the consequences of poor collaboration between colleges and schools. Goodlad (1990a) contended that the perpetuation of poor teaching practices and the inability of student teachers to transform theory into practice are due to poor collaborative efforts by universities and schools. Moreover, according to Darling-Hammond and Goodwin (1993), colleges normally have very little input regarding placement of preservice teachers; therefore, classroom experiences are often divorced from other parts of teacher education and fail to meet substantive needs of student teachers. Lasley, Matczynski, and Williams (1992) declared that, more often than not, the partnership between colleges and schools is noncollaborative, resulting in participants who do what has to be done instead of what needs to be done. A cooperative spirit has existed between the writer's education department and the primary school; this cooperative spirit has allowed preservice teacher placements at the school. Nevertheless, the relationship had not evolved into a true collaborative

effort between the college and school. The relationship could be described as Lasley et al. declared: The things that **had** to be done were done instead of things that **needed** to be done.

The literature from psychology, business, and education provided overwhelming evidence regarding the need for improvement in teacher education and the existence of the problem of inadequate field experiences for preservice teachers. Several causes for poor field experiences were reported, including (a) placement of preservice teachers under the tutelage of poor cooperating teachers; (b) overloaded, unappreciated college supervisors; (c) undesirable placement practices of school administrators; (d) placement in a single classroom; (e) isolation of teachers which impedes their professional growth; and (f) poor collaboration between colleges and schools. The information from these sources assisted the writer in addressing the problem of improving the quality of field experiences for preservice teachers.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The major goal to be accomplished in this practicum was to increase the number of qualified teachers at the primary school who would be willing to participate in the supervision of preservice teachers during their field experiences.

Expected Outcomes

There were four outcomes that were projected for this practicum. These included

1. A majority of those involved will attend the regularly-scheduled steering committee meetings in order to engage in more purposeful collaboration.

2. A majority of teachers involved will experience an increase in their proficiency as supervisors and mentors.

3. A greater number of the primary school teachers will participate in the supervision of preservice teachers during field experiences.

4. A majority of students involved will have satisfactory, convenient field experiences.

Measurement of Outcomes

For Outcome 1, the following evaluation tools were used: (a) a calendar documenting actual meeting dates and

subjects discussed, (b) audiotapes of the collaborative meetings, (c) a journal containing entries regarding the meetings, and (d) participants' statements regarding the status of the collaborative effort. The calendar, audiotapes, and journal were the responsibility of the writer. Although the audiotapes were valuable in reviewing the discussions, the writer feels that the journal was invaluable for making notations regarding nonverbal communication such as body language, facial gestures, and attitudes exhibited by participants. Following fall quarter, the writer asked those involved to write a narrative relating the progress they felt had been made toward true collaboration and relating improvements they felt needed to be made for the remainder of the school term. At the end of the academic year, she had the participants write a narrative evaluating the progress made during the entire year.

The standards of achievement that were acceptable demonstrations of success were (a) a majority of those involved would participate in all collaborative efforts between the college and school, (b) a majority would give positive evaluations regarding the process, and (c) the efforts would result in the establishment of the primary school as a type of professional development school for the college.

For Outcome 2, the evaluation tools used included

informal observations by and conversations with the writer as well as student teacher evaluations. These student teacher evaluations of their cooperating teacher (see Appendix B) and of their college supervisor (see Appendix C) were completed at the end of each quarter; these evaluations were reviewed by the college supervisor and the director of professional lab experiences.

The standard of achievement that was acceptable for indicating success was that a majority of the teachers at the school would complete requirements for the Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) endorsement, a state-recommended course for supervisors of student teachers.

For Outcome 3, the evaluation tool used was a comparison chart. This chart listed, by number, each teacher who was involved in supervision during the year and indicated which quarters she participated as a cooperating teacher. The numbers for participating teachers were assigned by the writer and all information was kept by her, always maintaining the anonymity of the teachers.

The standard of achievement that was acceptable for indicating success was that there would be an increase in the variety of teachers involved in supervision from Fall Quarter 1995 to Spring Quarter 1996.

For Outcome 4, the evaluation tools used included evaluations of cooperating teachers and college supervisors by the student teachers and a chart comparing the proximity

of field placements last academic year to this academic year. The evaluations used by the student teachers were the same as those used for Outcome 2, except the students were asked to write comments regarding their satisfaction with the field experience. College placement records were used to determine the location of field placement sites for early childhood student teachers during the two academic years.

The standards of achievement that were acceptable for indicating success included positive evaluations of the cooperating teacher and college supervisor from most student teachers, positive comments from most student teachers regarding their student teaching experience, and college records which indicated placement of a majority of early childhood students at the primary school.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

The problem that existed at the primary school was that there was a limited number of qualified and/or willing supervising teachers for the college's preservice teachers. Results of a survey given to the teachers indicated that only nine of 21 respondents had ever supervised a student teacher from the writer's college. Only four of the nine had ever received formal instruction in supervision. As a result of this small number of willing, qualified cooperating teachers, the director of field experiences at the college was forced to place early childhood preservice teachers in schools as distant as 50 miles from the campus.

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

The literature revealed a variety of solutions to the problem. Among the suggestions were to (a) have adequately prepared supervising teachers, (b) choose teachers and college supervisors who possess certain desirable characteristics, (c) increase collaboration between universities/colleges and schools, (d) have college professors who are part of both the college and school worlds, and (e) establish school-based teacher education.

Several sources (Garland & Shippy, 1991; Heath &

Cyphert, 1985; McIntyre & Killian, 1987) suggested that improvements in field experiences can be made by adequately preparing teachers who are responsible for the guidance and supervision of preservice teachers. Heath and Cyphert concluded that few institutions provide any type of development for teachers who fill this important role; however, Garland and Shippy provided suggestions for a research-based program that helps cooperating teachers develop the skills they need to be effective supervisors of student teachers. These sequential courses are included in the program and activities are provided for teachers to examine role expectations, to engage in reflective decision making, and to be involved in action research or the development of new material. Furthermore, McIntyre and Killian found that prepared cooperating teachers provide better field experiences for preservice teachers since they allow them to interact more with students and they provide the preservice teachers with more frequent feedback on their progress. McIntyre and Killian recommended further research in this area since teachers who volunteered for their study may have been different initially from those who chose not to participate. Adequately preparing supervising teachers would be one way to improve preservice teachers' field experiences.

Another way to improve field experiences is to choose public school teachers and college supervisors who possess certain desirable characteristics and who are able to

fulfill various role expectations. Beebe and Margerison (1995) concluded that cooperating teachers should possess (a) a positive attitude toward and preparation for having a student teacher; (b) the ability to plan ahead on matters concerning the sharing of routine tasks; (c) superior modeling of effective teaching techniques; (d) the willingness to allow the student teacher to observe other teachers; (e) the ability to shift roles "from modeling to collaborating, analyzing, supporting, and evaluating" (p. 36).

The writer's college has certain expectations for cooperating teachers. Barr (1995) gave the following criteria:

1. Cooperating teachers should hold a valid teaching certificate in both the field in which he is teaching and the field in which the student teacher is interning.

2. They should have at least 3 years of successful teaching experience, demonstrating expertise as a teacher.

3. Cooperating teachers should be volunteers and should never be coerced into taking a student teacher.

4. They should support the teaching philosophy of their school district and of the college.

5. They should be able to evaluate the performance of student teachers and communicate effectively with the student teacher and the college supervisor.

6. Cooperating teachers should not be related to the

student teacher and it is desirable that there be no family connections within the school.

7. It is recommended that cooperating teachers have certificate endorsements for data collecting and/or teacher support services.

Since the cooperating teachers have greater influence over student teachers than anyone else, it is imperative that they meet most, if not all, of the criteria stated.

In the literature, role expectations for the college supervisor are made clear. Of course, she is the liaison between the college and the public school and, according to Reebe and Margerison (1995), the college supervisor has a number of responsibilities, such as (a) explaining the college program; (b) conducting observations of student teachers and providing written evaluations and feedback to them; (c) collaborating with the cooperating teacher and student teacher on curriculum, teaching techniques, and technology; (d) meeting informally with teachers as often as possible to discuss matters of mutual concern; and (e) providing structure for networking among cooperating teachers, student and novice teachers, and college faculty.

In addition to expectations for cooperating teachers, Marrou (1988-1989) concluded that several factors should be considered before using a college professor as a supervisor. She emphasized that supervisors should have public school teaching experiences within the last 5 years, that they

should have at least 3 years of teaching experience, and that graduate students who are used as supervisors should maintain an acceptable grade point average and have posted a score of at least 1000 on the GRE. Marrou also surveyed cooperating teachers who responded by saying that they prefer college supervisors who are well-organized, informative regarding instructional guidelines, adept at assessing students in a realistic manner, and adept at giving them suggestions for improvement. Cooperating teachers further stated that they prefer those supervisors who hold high expectations for student teachers and help them meet those standards, who visit the classroom regularly and help establish a good relationship between cooperating teacher and student teacher, and who share ideas and techniques. As one can see, several characteristics are desirable for both cooperating teachers and college supervisors if field experiences for preservice teachers are to be of the highest quality.

Many studies suggested increasing collaboration between universities/colleges and schools as another way to improve field experiences for preservice teachers. Goodlad (1984) recommended the establishment of "key" or "demonstration" schools and recommended that student teachers be placed only in these key schools. More recently, Goodlad (1994) recommended the establishment of partner schools and centers of pedagogy, with partnerships being established among all

those involved in teacher education: colleges of education, arts and sciences faculty, and public school personnel. He concluded that these schools will increase coherence in teacher education, will help preservice teachers make the connection between theory and practice, and will assist public school teachers in keeping abreast of the latest knowledge and teaching strategies in their field.

The Holmes Group (1986, 1991) declared that creating professional development schools analagous to the medical profession's teaching hospitals is the answer to providing prospective teachers with carefully structured practicum and student teaching experiences. They concluded that these professional development schools would improve field experiences for preservice teachers and would improve overall teacher preparation. A few months after the Holmes Report was published, the Carnegie Foundation (1986) reiterated the need for better relationships between college faculty and K-12 faculty. Their recommendation was for establishment of "clinical" or "lead" schools. Goodlad's key schools, partner schools, and centers of pedagogy; the Holmes Group's professional development schools; and the Carnegie Foundation's clinical schools are all recommended for the same purposes: to increase collaboration between colleges and schools and to improve the quality of field experiences and teacher education.

Several other sources stressed the need for a

collaborative effort between schools and colleges. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (1987) criteria for effective field experience programs stressed the need for collaborative relationships in order to provide preservice teachers with effective preparation for teaching. In addition, Arends (1990) provided several examples of how universities and schools need to collaborate for the improvement of field experiences. He contended that teacher education centers be established whose faculty would serve as supervisors of student teachers and as staff development providers for public school teachers. Other concepts mentioned included learning centers and the concept of using designated public school teachers as clinical teachers. These teachers receive faculty status from the university, provide supervision for student teachers, and participate in research and other projects.

Moreover, Meade (1991) recommended establishing clinical schools with the three factions--schools, colleges and universities, and professional organizations--having equal responsibility for the supervision and development of student teachers. These clinical schools, according to Meade, should have the following characteristics:

1. They should be public schools with students representative of the population at large.

2. Clinical schools should be able to handle a large

number of teacher candidates and should encourage their development, as well as the continued development of veteran faculty.

3. They should demonstrate excellent pedagogy and should be continually engaged in improving instruction to meet the needs of their students.

Nagel and Driscoll (1992) further emphasized the importance of collaboration between universities and schools. They found that student teachers are confused when they encounter the differences between theory learned in the college classroom and practices they encounter in the public school classroom. More often than not, they assume the practices of their cooperating teacher, forgetting what they were taught in college. Nagel and Driscoll emphasized the importance of collaborative effort among college personnel, school personnel, and student teachers. Boyd (1994) stated that increased collaboration can lead to developing partnerships to meet the needs of all parties.

The Sid W. Richardson Foundation (1993) extended the idea of collaboration by stating that college professors need to live in both worlds in order to improve preparation of teachers and administrators. The plethora of literature concerning the need for collaborative efforts between colleges and schools convinces one that this is a viable step in improving field experiences for preservice teachers.

Another answer to the problem, according to Dill and

Stafford (1994), is establishing school-based teacher education. After thorough orientation to their school, teacher candidates would attend summer sessions to learn how to plan and write lesson plans, strategies for classroom management and discipline, and models of teaching. In addition, seminars would be provided so that preservice teachers could receive intensive training in such topics as "motivation, positive discipline, stress management, violence prevention, and communication skills" (p. 621). The following year, students would be interns at the school and, at the end of the year, would take any tests required for certification.

Undeniably, the literature was replete with suggestions for improving field experiences for preservice teachers. Among the suggested solutions were (a) preparing cooperating teachers for the job, (b) choosing cooperating teachers and supervising teachers who possess desirable traits, (c) increasing collaboration between universities/colleges and schools, (d) having professors live in both worlds, and (e) establishing school-based teacher education.

Description and Justification for Solution Selected

The writer incorporated a number of ideas from the literature in an effort to improve preservice teachers' field experiences. First of all, as suggested by the Sid W. Richardson Foundation (1993), she was the college professor

who lived in both worlds. The school provided the writer with an office which was used by the former school counselor and provided her with a mail slot for her use. Instead of the 4 partial days presented in the proposal, school administrators and the writer decided that it would work best if the writer were in the school a minimum of 1 full day and 2 half days. As a result of this increased visibility at the school, the writer became accepted as part of the school community.

One result of the education department survey given to the primary school teachers was that 21 of the 21 respondents expressed interest in establishing the school as a professional development school for the college. Because of this expressed interest, the writer worked intensely with a cadre of teachers and administrators in order to lay the foundation for and begin the establishment of the primary school as a professional development school for the college. She incorporated some of the suggestions from the literature, from personal experience, and from other sources which she encountered during the implementation phase of the practicum.

The writer was prepared to try a number of approaches in an attempt to solve the problem of inadequate field experiences and in an attempt to facilitate the development of the primary school as a professional development school. The most important task, as stressed by Marrou (1988-1989)

and Beebe and Margerison (1995), was to establish an open line of communication between the college supervisor and the school personnel. She accomplished this mainly in two ways: (a) through the establishment of a steering committee which was composed of two representatives (one elected by teachers, one appointed by administrators) from each grade level K-2, at least one administrator, the media specialist, and the writer and (b) through what Beebe and Margerison referred to as informal interactions with teachers.

Once communication was established, the writer was prepared to move toward providing staff development and/or modeling techniques which would enhance the veteran teachers' pedagogical and supervisory skills. Several sources (Garland & Shippy, 1991; Heath & Cyphert, 1985; McIntyre & Killian, 1987) stressed the need for improving the quality of cooperating teachers. Other sources (Barr, 1995; Beebe & Margerison, 1995) delineated traits that are desirable for cooperating teachers. Furthermore, Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992) and Goodlad (1990a) emphasized the need for teachers to become well-versed in current methods of pedagogy. Through demonstration lessons and individual conferences, the writer enhanced the ability of cooperating teachers to exhibit these traits and to practice effective teaching techniques.

In addition to providing individual conferences and classroom activities, the writer used current literature and

informal discussions to keep primary school teachers aware of current trends and issues in education. Many of these precipitated from the interests and needs of the teachers; some were chosen by the writer. The literature and discussions helped teachers connect theory to practice. By making this connection, cooperating teachers enhanced the preservice teachers' field experiences by helping them see the relationship between college classroom knowledge and actual classroom practice.

Throughout the practicum implementation the writer functioned in a number of roles. She worked to establish collaboration between the college and school, she was the facilitator of steering committee meetings, she acted as supervisor of student teachers, she arranged staff development for teachers, she demonstrated classroom strategies, she worked with students who were experiencing difficulty in reading, and she provided literature on and participated in informal discussions about current issues in education. As a result of these combined efforts, progress was made toward solving the problem of inadequately prepared teachers and inadequate field experiences for preservice teachers.

Report of Action Taken

Because the premise in creating a professional development school is to meet the needs of the teachers, student teachers, and college, it was impossible to plan

exactly what would occur during the 8-month implementation. The writer did, however, have a plan to guide the implementation in the direction in which she planned to proceed. Her plans were based on ideas gleaned from information in the literature and from personal communication with a professor who had established this type of collaboration with several public schools. What actually occurred evolved from the needs of the participants in the practicum.

The practicum implementation began when the writer met with the education division chairperson and the director of professional lab experiences to inform them of her final plans for the practicum. Both the division chairperson and the director of professional lab experiences gave their approval and support. Once the college officials gave their approval, she set up a meeting with school and system administrators to discuss ways to involve teachers from the inception of the practicum and discussed the formation of the steering committee. At the same meeting, she approached school officials regarding some release time for teachers to attend steering committee meetings and/or staff development sessions. During the first month she also met with the steering committee for the first time.

In the first quarter of the practicum, several activities occurred simultaneously. The writer was busy establishing communication with and providing assistance to

teachers throughout the school. She also obtained names of those teachers interested in completing a 50-hour staff development class which was designed to provide them with skills as student teacher supervisors and as mentors. This course, offered free of charge by college faculty members, was designed to provide teachers with 10 staff development unit (SDU) credits. Upon completion of this course, teachers would receive state endorsement as teacher support specialists (TSS). In the writer's state, this endorsement entitles cooperating teachers to receive $ 250.00 for each student teacher supervised instead of the normal $ 50.00 stipend received by teachers who have not earned the special TSS endorsement.

The writer also began meeting with the steering committee every Tuesday. This committee met weekly throughout most of the practicum. One of the purposes of the initial meetings was to find common ground among the members of the committee through activities such as journaling and sharing their ideas with each other. Based on information received from Dr. Mary Ellen Cosgrove (personal communication, September 22, 1995), the major functions of the steering committee were to establish (a) their concept and definition of a professional development school, (b) a vision statement and goals, and (c) a plan for projects and staff development. The plans for staff development were based upon the needs of the teachers.

Although teachers had expressed interest in staff development on mentoring, developmental learning, cooperative learning, classroom management, critical thinking skills, and discipline, their most intense interest was in the areas of discipline, stress management, and nutrition and its effects on healthy lifestyles. Rosaen and Hoekwater (1990) recommended that prioritizing these projects is a good idea; therefore, this was done.

At the beginning of winter quarter, the steering committee presented its version of the mission statement and goals, in writing, to the faculty, staff, and administrators. After a week, the steering committee members held grade meetings to determine if consensus had been reached. The committee members then brought the results of the grade level meetings to the next steering committee meeting and the committee's final draft was written (see Appendix D). This document was presented to the faculty for acceptance; it received their unanimous support. Once the mission statement and goals were accepted, the writer had a reception to mark the official beginning of the professional development school concept and to honor the teachers at the school. This reception was well attended by faculty and administrators representing the school, the school system, and the college. Extensive news coverage was given by the local newspapers and by the college's public relations department.

The steering committee continued to hold weekly meetings to discuss areas of concern. Agenda items included the following: compensation time for teachers who participated in staff development workshops after school hours, articles of interest placed in the teachers'lounge/eating area, workshop topics, poor discipline in the school, lack of administrative consistency in handling matters of discipline and in writing citations on teachers who referred students to the office for disciplinary measures, options teachers and administrators had for dealing with severely disruptive students, and audiotapes and videotapes on effective discipline strategies. In all of these meetings, the writer was careful to be as unbiased as possible, but was open and honest with the committee members.

During winter quarter, the members of the steering committee solicited opinions from their grade levels and determined that school-wide forums could not be held; however, some of the teachers expressed interest in current readings in education. Articles were provided by the writer, based on teacher requests, and these were placed in a special box in the teachers' lounge/eating area. The writer engaged teachers in informal discussions regarding ideas presented by the authors of the articles. Hopefully knowledge gained from the literature enabled teachers to engage in more meaningful, substantive dialogue and less

emotion-laden opinions.

As in the previous months, the writer continued to supervise student teachers, to coordinate professional development school activities, to act as a resource person for teachers, and to lead in problem-solving on any dilemmas that occurred. By this time, she was considered a part of the primary school team, thus making it more possible for her to make suggestions for improvements in school procedures and classroom practices and making it possible for teachers to feel comfortable giving her feedback regarding the college's teacher preparation program.

One staff development workshop was offered winter quarter. The topic, stress management, was determined by the steering committee and was based on requests from the teachers. This staff development was provided by the head of the physical education department at the college. Workshop participants received compensation time for attending the session.

In addition to meeting with the steering committee and arranging the staff development workshop, the writer continued to act as a resource person for all teachers and as a supervisor for the student teachers who were assigned to the school. During winter quarter only, she also placed and supervised 22 practicum students from her two methods classes.

As a culminating activity for winter quarter, the

writer invited two of the primary school faculty to be guest lecturers in her classes on the college campus. She chose these teachers because of their enthusiasm and innovation in teaching and because they could demonstrate the relevance of college classroom theory to actual classroom practice.

When spring quarter began, the writer continued to hold weekly meetings with the steering committee. As a result of teachers' overwhelming concerns about discipline problems at the school, the principal requested that the committee begin work on editing and revising the school handbook and on writing a more clearly-defined, stricter code of discipline for implementation during the 1996-1997 school year. The necessary collaboration took place and the plan will be submitted to the board of education during the July board meeting. By this time, committee members were able to communicate openly and honestly with each other and were confident enough and willing to suggest to administrators some improvements they felt needed to be made in the school program. The walls of isolation started to crumble and teachers began to claim some of their power.

Toward the end of spring quarter, another workshop was held for teachers. Again, this was determined by the teachers themselves and was on a variety of topics related to nutrition and healthy lifestyles. The workshop was arranged by the writer and, by popular demand, was provided by the same college faculty member.

At this time, two additional faculty members were asked to be guest lecturers in the writer's classes. One, the media specialist, gave the students a comprehensive look at how teachers incorporate media into their lessons, giving major emphasis to the latest technological devices such as computer assisted instruction and distance learning. The other, a first grade teacher who is the epitome of a professional teacher, spoke with students about teaching as a profession and what being a professional entails.

The writer continued to supervise student teachers and continued to function as a resource person for teachers. Part of her responsibility throughout the implementation was to provide teachers with whatever resources they needed. During this year, she provided assistance in many small ways. Some of the most important provisions follow.

1. A field trip was arranged for first graders to visit the music department at the college. This trip enabled young students to hear professional musicians perform on the musical instruments for which the classical masters composed their pieces.

2. During the week before Christmas break, the writer, as a gift to the teachers, volunteered to read stories and sing holiday songs with every class in the school.

3. The writer demonstrated hands-on math techniques for slower learners and worked throughout the year with

second grade nonreaders.

4. During fall and spring quarters, the writer served as the coordinator for a project involving distance learning. This involved participants in four sites: the primary school, an elementary school 90 miles away, a state college 90 miles away, and the writers' private college.

5. While the committee was working on the new school-wide discipline plan, she provided the opportunity for teachers to hear guidelines for effective, positive disciplining as presented by the professor who teaches classroom management and discipline at the college.

6. During the last week of school, as her gift to the paraprofessionals, the writer assumed lunchroom duty for every paraprofessional at the school. She also substituted one day in the in-school suspension room during recess detention.

On the last day of postplanning, the writer honored all teachers at the primary school, with special recognition being given to those who served on the steering committee and as cooperating teachers. In addition, she expressed appreciation to those who participated in staff development activities and to all who cooperated during the practicum implementation. She also emphasized her desire for the professional development school partnership to continue.

After postplanning, the writer began to gather data for analyzing the results of the practicum. She read and

analyzed journal notations, teacher narratives, student teacher evaluations, college placement records and other data to determine whether or not the outcomes of the practicum had been met.

Several events occurred during the practicum which were not anticipated during the proposal stage. First of all, school district and school politics had a detrimental effect on the teachers' attitudes. The board of education chairman, an educated and well-respected community leader, was defeated in the November election and two new board members were elected to serve. Both of these men are ultraconservatives and have been extremely negative and vocal regarding the school district and its practices; therefore, teachers were more reluctant to get involved in any change process. The effect of school politics was also negative: School administrators were engaged in covert conflict, faculty members aligned with one or the other, and a rift occurred among the faculty. A greater misunderstanding occurred between teachers when two of the grades disagreed on how anticipated federal funds would be spent. These political alliances and hurt feelings caused much of the teachers' reluctance to participate in some of the proposed activities of the practicum.

A second unanticipated event was the teachers' lack of interest in taking the proposed TSS course. Seven of the teachers took the course during the summer of 1995; however,

school administrators indicated that nearly all of the remaining primary school teachers would be interested in completing this course. Because of this, it was surprising to learn that only four teachers were willing to make the commitment to take the course during winter quarter. Consequently, plans to offer it were canceled. Furthermore, a board of education decision to move to homogeneous grouping in reading and math was the causal factor for an exorbitant number of hours spent in meetings from January to May. Since all teachers were involved in these meetings, none of them were interested in taking the TSS course after school. As a result, the writer decided to offer it during July, a time when teachers indicated they would be more amenable to making the commitment.

Another unanticipated event was the teachers' lack of interest in school-wide forums. This attitude was precipitated by the number of hours spent in grouping meetings. The teachers' energies were being channeled into this effort and into their teaching; they had little desire to become involved in any after-school effort. The writer made a decision to substitute current readings from the literature on a variety of interesting topics. These articles were made available in the teachers' lounge/eating area and were the basis for informal discussions among them.

A positive unanticipated event occurred during the practicum implementation. A mandate from school

administrators declared that each classroom should have at least two reading groups since the students, at that time, were heterogeneously grouped. Several who were already utilizing the multi-group technique were chosen as mentors for those who were not. Observation times were scheduled and mentors demonstrated how to organize and teach more than one group in a classroom. The fact that teachers were willing to demonstrate a lesson for their peers indicated that, in the future, more peer coaching and teaching may occur.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem that existed was that there was a shortage of teachers in close proximity to the college who were certified and/or were willing to supervise preservice teachers during their field experiences. This problem caused some early childhood education majors to endure inadequate and frustrating student teaching experiences. Additionally, it caused students and faculty to drive many miles, thereby wasting precious time in transit and causing excessive travel expense for students and the college.

In an effort to solve the problem, the writer decided to establish a professional development school for the college at a nearby primary school. The process included (a) working with a cadre of teachers and administrators to write the mission statement and goals for the PDS partnership, (b) establishing rapport with all school personnel (i.e., central office and building administrators, faculty, special area teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, lunchroom workers, and custodians), (c) encouraging open communication among all participants, (d) establishing credibility with the faculty through the demonstration of the willingness and ability to assist them with classroom concerns, (e) providing resources and being a resource for teachers, and (f) acting as a liaison between the college and the school. All of these components were essential in

establishing the primary school as a professional development school for the college.

Results

The following outcomes were projected for this practicum.

Outcome 1: A majority of those involved will attend the regularly-scheduled steering committee meetings in order to engage in more purposeful collaboration. The standards of achievement that would be acceptable for demonstrating success would be that (a) a majority of those involved participated in all collaborative efforts between the college and school, (b) a majority gave positive evaluations regarding the process, and (c) the efforts resulted in the establishment of the primary school as a type of professional development school for the college.

This outcome was met.

All participants attended most of the steering committee meetings; very few absences were recorded. In addition, all participants attended the other functions sponsored by the PDS initiative. They also wrote positive evaluations of the PDS effort and the primary school was established officially as a PDS for the writer's college. The writer used her journal to document attendance at meetings; she used audiotapes and notes in her journal to record the proceedings of each meeting. At the end of fall and spring quarters, she collected written statements from

participants in order to evaluate the status of the collaborative effort.

Outcome 2: A majority of teachers involved will experience an increase in their proficiencies as supervisors and mentors. There was one standard of achievement that would be acceptable for indicating success: a majority of the teachers at the school would complete requirements for the Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) endorsement, a state-recommended course for supervisors of student teachers.

This outcome was not met.

The writer reviewed evaluation forms to determine that student teachers rated their cooperating teachers and their supervising teachers very highly and had positive comments to make about their student teaching experiences. Unfortunately, these did not suffice as evidence that the outcome had been met since the stated standard of achievement was that a majority of teachers would complete the TSS course.

Outcome 3: A greater number of the primary school teachers will participate in the supervision of preservice teachers during field experiences. The standard of achievement that would be acceptable for demonstrating success was that there was an increase in the variety of teachers involved in supervision from Fall Quarter 1995 to Spring Quarter 1996.

This outcome was met.

Table 1 displays the number of different teachers involved in supervising early childhood practicum students and student teachers during the implementation.

Outcome 4: A majority of students involved will have satisfactory, convenient field experiences. Standards of achievement that would be acceptable for indicating success were (a) most student teachers would give positive evaluations of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor, (b) most student teachers would make positive comments regarding their student teaching experience, and (c) college placement records would indicate that a majority of early childhood students was placed at the primary school.

This outcome was met.

To document this, the writer reviewed all written evaluations and written comments by student teachers each quarter. College student teacher placement records for the 1994-1995 and 1995-1996 academic years were reviewed to determine the proximity of field placements to the college. Table 2 depicts the number of early childhood students placed and the number of miles from the college they were placed.

Table 1

Teachers Involved in Field Experiences

N=20

Teacher	Fall	Winter	Spring
1		*2	**1
2	*2		
3			**1
4	*1		**1
5		**1	
6		*1	
7		*2	
8		*1	
9		*2	
10	*1	*2	
11		*2	
12		*2	**1
13	*2	**1	
14		*3	
15	**1		**1
16			*2
17	**1	*1	
18	*2		
19	**1		*2
20	*1	*2	

Note. * = practicum students, ** = student teachers

Table 2

Proximity of Field Placements to College Campus

N=42

Quarter	NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS 1-15 mi.	16-30 mi.	31-45 mi.	45+ mi.
Fall 1994	0	2	2	1
Fall 1995	4	1	0	0
Winter 1995	4	1	6	2
Winter 1996	2	0	0	0
Spring 1995	6	1	4	0
Spring 1996	5	1	0	0

Discussion

The major goal for this practicum was to increase the number of qualified teachers at the primary school who would be willing to participate in the supervision of preservice teachers during their field experiences. To realize this goal it was necessary to take a number of carefully-planned steps which led to the establishment of the primary school as a PDS for the college and led to an increase in the number of teachers who were willing to supervise preservice teachers.

The first step in the process was to establish a steering committee composed of the following members: two representatives from each grade level, one elected by the teachers and one appointed by the administration; at least

one administrator; the media specialist; and the writer. The main tasks for this committee included (a) learning to collaborate with each other and with the writer, (b) writing the mission statement and goals for the PDS, (c) acting as liaisons between the committee and the teachers, and (d) prioritizing PDS activities. As they completed these tasks, the committee members participated in shared decision making in matters that directly affected them. According to Tewel in his article on collaborative supervision (1989), this type of participation motivates teachers and encourages them to take a more active role in school affairs; however, the role change is often difficult to achieve and the progress is sometimes slow.

These steering committee meetings were attended consistently by those involved. When journal records of the meetings were analyzed, the writer confirmed that the first standard of achievement for Outcome 1 had been met: A majority of the steering committee was in attendance at every meeting.

The writer decided that, after organizing the steering committee, her most important task was to establish an open line of communication with participants and to establish herself as their ally. Just as the Sid W. Richardson Foundation (1993) declared, in order to initiate collaboration among the steering committee members and in order to be accepted as their advocate, the writer had to be

able to live in both worlds: the college and the public school. This is exactly what she did. Not only was being accepted as their ally crucial to the success of the practicum, the importance of collaboration with them cannot be overemphasized. Numerous accounts in the literature declared that collaboration between the two worlds of academia must occur before preservice teachers' field experiences and education, in general, can be improved significantly (Arends, 1990; The Carnegie Foundation, 1986; Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993; Goodlad, 1990a, 1994; The Holmes Group, 1986, 1991; Lasley, Matczynski, & Williams, 1992; Meade, 1991; Nagel & Driscoll, 1992; The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1987).

Teachers' comments evaluating the PDS effort offered proof that the second standard of achievement for Outcome 1 was met. All comments were positive regarding improved collaboration between the college and school and major tasks accomplished by the PDS steering committee.

Some of the comments about the collaborative effort were that (a) communication had improved between the two schools primarily as a result of the writer's being highly visible at the school several days each week, (b) feelings of cooperation were more apparent, (c) feelings of being a part of the teacher preparation program had increased, (d) understanding the roles played by each school had improved, and (e) resources available from the college were better

understood.

Only three negative comments were made regarding the PDS. Two referred to the fact that preservice teachers came at inconvenient times for teachers; some students expected teachers to adjust teaching schedules to their convenience. A third comment alluded to the fact that the number and intensity of grouping meetings drained teachers of their energy and made them less enthusiastic about attending meetings related to the PDS initiative. Teachers had to accept major responsibility for regrouping plans and for the establishment of the PDS partnership. The writer heard some lament that they wished they could just go to their classrooms and teach. This attitude illustrates what Tewel (1989) meant when he said that role changes are difficult and that progress comes slowly.

All but one of the members of the steering committee stated that major accomplishments made by the committee were the revision of the entire school handbook and the accompanying extensive study of the school's discipline problems. This study of discipline resulted in the writing of a new, more clearly-defined, stricter code of discipline for the 1996-1997 school year. This accomplishment really impressed teachers who had, for many years, been unsuccessful in effecting a change in the discipline policy.

Another significant accomplishment of the collaborative effort which was cited by most participants was having the

writer in the school as a resource person. Several referred to specific activities which were meaningful to them (e.g., answering teachers' questions regarding student teachers, providing current literature on various topics, working with students who were experiencing difficulty learning, providing help with teachers' problems). When the writer perused the teachers' narratives, it was evident that the second standard of achievement for Outcome 1 had been met.

The third standard of achievement that was acceptable for indicating success on Outcome 1 was the establishment of the primary school as a PDS for the college. The faculty's acceptance of the mission statement and goals marked the official beginning of the PDS relationship, although months of collaboration and work preceded this event. During January, a reception, hosted by the writer and her college and attended by college and school dignitaries and faculty, was held to celebrate this accomplishment. At this point, all standards of achievement for Outcome 1 were met.

Outcome 2, increasing teachers' proficiencies as supervisors and mentors, was another step toward increasing the number of qualified cooperating teachers and toward improving preservice teachers' field experiences. The standard of achievement for Outcome 2 was that a majority of the teachers would complete the TSS course during the practicum implementation. This outcome was not met because the extra responsibilities placed on teachers throughout the

year consumed most of their energy and left them unwilling to make an after-school commitment. Another reason was because seven of the most dedicated, motivated primary school teachers took the course during the Summer of 1995. As a result of this writer's efforts and the PDS initiative, the course will be offered in July and will be taught cooperatively by five faculty members from the college. Nine teachers from the PDS have indicated they will take the course. Upon completion of the classroom implementation phase in the fall, 20 of 34 PDS teachers will be state-certified for the supervision of preservice teachers.

Although the stated standard of achievement was not met, the writer feels that it is important to record that she met with cooperating teachers at the beginning of each quarter, enumerating her expectations for student teachers, for practicum students, and for them. They were provided handbooks which explained, in detail, all aspects of the field experiences. She also worked closely with the teachers on any questions they had regarding expectations of the college and regarding their role as supervising teachers. These group and individual conferences answered experienced and inexperienced cooperating teachers' most frequent questions: "What is expected of me?" (Anderson, 1964, p. 57) and "How can I best provide students with what they need?" They also helped teachers gain confidence in themselves as supervisors, thus improving preservice

teachers' field experiences.

Student teacher evaluations regarding the proficiency of cooperating teachers and the college supervisor are also worthy of mention. Most of the students rated their supervisors as being highly proficient in all areas; however, a couple of students rated the cooperating teachers as being below average on the following indicators: (a) the teacher oriented the intern to the classroom/school setting, (b) the teacher guided the intern in her planning for instruction, and (c) the teacher conducted formal (sit-down) conferences with the intern. All other ratings were above average and most ranked 6 or 7 on a 7-point scale. Although Outcome 2 was not met as stated in the standard of achievement, records indicated that progress was made toward increasing PDS teachers' proficiency as supervisors and mentors.

Another step toward reaching the major goal for the practicum implementation was Outcome 3: a greater number of the primary school teachers would participate in the supervision of preservice teachers. The results in Table 1 indicate that the standard of achievement for this outcome was met. Twenty of the 34 primary school teachers participated in this endeavor. Only 2 of the 20 supervised practicum students more than 1 quarter; only one had a student teacher more than 1 quarter.

These practicum and student teaching assignments were

carefully planned by the assistant principal and the writer; therefore, nothing was left to chance. Students were placed under the tutelage of teachers who had a positive attitude toward supervising them (Beebe & Margerison, 1995), who volunteered their assistance (Barr, 1995), and who were adequately prepared for the task (Garland & Shippy, 1991; Heath & Cyphert, 1985; McIntyre & Killian, 1987). By voluntarily sharing their classrooms with preservice teachers, these 20 veteran teachers indicated their willingness to overcome the isolationism referred to by Darling-Hammond (1990) and Maeroff (1993) as being deterrents to improving teaching and to improving field experiences for preservice teachers.

Not only did a greater number of teachers participate, but the required daily grouping meetings caused student teachers to be placed in a variety of classrooms throughout their student teaching experience. This afforded them the opportunity to adjust to working with all ages and ability levels of children and with teachers of differing proficiency levels. This multi-class placement also enabled students to avoid what Zeichner (1992) referred to as one of the structural barriers to effective preservice teacher learning during field experiences: placement in a single classroom. Additionally, Goodlad (1990b) stated that student teachers need to be exposed to the entire school in order to understand the spectrum of their responsibilities,

to understand the school's function and problems, and to start their teaching careers determined to solve these problems. On the surface, what appeared to college students and to school staff as being detrimental to their having positive field experiences was, in actuality, advantageous. At this point in the practicum implementation, the writer determined that the standard of achievement for Outcome 3 and the major goal of the practicum had been met.

The fourth and final outcome for the practicum was that a majority of students involved would have satisfactory, convenient field experiences. The writer studied student teacher evaluations of the cooperating and the supervising teachers to determine the degree of satisfaction felt by students. As stated earlier in the discussion, these evaluations by student teachers, both rating scales and comments, were overwhelmingly positive. The writer also reviewed college placement records to determine location of field placements during the past 2 academic years. Table 2 depicts the number of early childhood student teachers placed each quarter and depicts the distance they were placed from the college campus. Table 2 and the evaluations by student teachers give evidence that the standards of achievement for this outcome were met.

The writer was able to achieve the major goal of the practicum and was able to achieve 3 of 4 projected outcomes. The implementation of this practicum had a positive effect

on early childhood preservice teachers' field experiences and proved beneficial for all who participated in the effort.

Recommendations

1. The establishment of a professional development school is a tremendous project. Those who decide to participate in such a venture must be robust, resilient, and resolute. It is not a task for those who are unfocused and unwilling to sacrifice many hours of personal time. Although it is difficult for public school teachers, most of their effort was expended during school hours. This was not the case for the writer. In addition to spending time in the public school, she was required to continue with all of her responsibilities at the college. Even though the writer enjoyed the amount of time spent at the primary school, perhaps a less strenuous schedule could be developed for those college professors who wish to undertake the establishment of a professional development school.
2. Having a plan and working the plan was most beneficial in this effort since it gave the steering committee a beginning point and defined tasks that needed to be accomplished. It is important to note, however, that plans must not be rigid and must satisfy the needs of both schools.
3. From the very first day the writer worked toward establishing positive relationships with the entire school

faculty and staff, not just the steering committee members. Becoming a part of the public school is essential in the establishment of a PDS. Since this writer already knew most of the school staff, establishing this relationship was no problem; however, college faculty who are strangers in the proposed partner school will need to make an earnest effort to accomplish this.

4. One must be prepared to accept the fact that establishing a PDS does not always hold equal importance in the agenda of all those involved. When situations arise that need teachers' and administrators' immediate attention, the PDS effort is not of top priority. These situations are temporary, however, and the benefits of establishing a PDS are worth the wait.

5. Working with children and demonstrating teaching techniques were important ways the writer used to demonstrate her teaching ability and her willingness to share her expertise with teachers and students in the school. It was disappointing, however, that more teachers did not take advantage of her expertise. A more definitive plan in this area and in the area of staff development offerings would facilitate more meaningful use of the college professor's knowledge and of her time.

6. It is important to involve public school teachers in college classrooms. The four teachers who participated in this venture were honored that the writer would invite them

to be guest lecturers. Their expertise was recognized by the college students and their real world experiences were shared in college classrooms. This shared teaching responsibility gave preservice teachers the opportunity to see how teachers in the real world link theory to practice and afforded the public school teachers the opportunity to enjoy a new teaching experience. Although that was an accomplishment of which one can be proud, many more of the PDS teachers should be involved in team teaching with college professors. It would be even more advantageous if the teaching could take place at the public school instead of in college classrooms. It is possible that distance learning facilities in the two schools could be utilized in this effort.

The writer will continue to act as the official liaison between the college and the PDS. It is her hope that (a) her expertise in curriculum, in instruction, and in supervision will be utilized more extensively by teachers and administrators at the PDS and (b) the partnership between the two schools will continue to flourish.

Dissemination

The writer has shared progress in this practicum with many people. First of all, she was invited to explain briefly the PDS concept to members of the Parent Teacher Organization at the primary school. Then, several board of education members approached her for an explanation of the

PDS project. Favorable comments and guarantees of support were received from these two sources.

The education faculty at the college and the writer's students have been informed of the progress of the practicum throughout the implementation. Several times during the year, the division chairperson asked the writer to share progress reports during faculty meetings. Students in the writer's classes were kept abreast of the situation; many of them were in practicums and were a part of the implementation.

The professional development school partnership has been featured in a number of newspapers and in the college's official magazine. These communications spread information throughout this area, the state, and beyond.

Further plans for dissemination include sharing the final results with the education faculty and with the PDS faculty. In addition, much of the information collected during the practicum can be used as a resource for writing articles for publication, for presenting at professional conferences, and for providing consulting services to those interested in establishing a PDS.

References

Allison, P. C. (1988). Strategies of observing during field experiences. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 59(2), 28-30.

Andrews, L. O. (1964). Student teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Arends, R. (1990). Connecting the university to the school. In B. Joyce (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development (pp. 117-143). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bachtel, D. C., & Boatright, S. R. (Eds.). (1993). The Georgia county guide. Athens, GA: Cooperative Extension Service, University of Georgia.

Barr, B. (1995). The student teaching handbook. Mt. Vernon, GA: Brewton-Parker College Department of Education.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Beebe, S. J., & Margerison, P. S. (1995). Teaching the newest members of the family to teach: Whose responsibility? English Journal, 84(2), 33-37.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Clark, R. W. (1988). School-university relationships: An interpretive review. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action (pp. 32-65). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. Teachers College Record, 91(1), 59-80.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Accountability and teacher professionalism. In F. Schultz (Ed.), Education 90/91 (pp. 196-205). Guilford, CT: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenge, and promise. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 1-27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Goodwin, A. L. (1993). Progress toward professionalism in teaching. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), Challenges and achievements of American education (pp. 19-52). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dill, V., & Stafford, D. (1994). School-based teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 620-627.

Garland, C., & Shippy, V. (1991). Improving the student teaching context: A research-based program for cooperating teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 13(1), 37-41.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990a). Places where teachers are taught. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990b). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heath, P., & Cyphert, F. (1985). A report of the curriculum of early field experiences in selected teacher education programs in Ohio (Report No. SP026565). Ohio: Ohio Northern University & The Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 003)

Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group, Inc. (1991). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Howe, H., II. (1993). Thinking about our kids. New York: The Free Press.

Lasley, T. J., Matczynski, T. J., & Williams, J. A. (1992). Collaborative and noncollaborative structures in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 257-261.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. New York: Teachers College Press.

Maeroff, G. I. (1993). Team building for school change: Equipping teachers for new roles. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marrou, J. R. (1988-1989). The university supervisor: A new role in a changing workplace. The Teacher Educator, 24(3), 13-19.

McDermott, P., Gormley, K., Rothenberg, J., & Hammer, J. (1995). The influence of classroom practica experiences on student teachers' thoughts about teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 46, 184-191.

McIntyre, D. J., & Killian, J. E. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on preservice teachers' development during early field experiences. Journal of Educational Research, 80, 277-282.

Meade, E. J., Jr. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 666-669.

Nagel, N., & Driscoll, A. (1992). Dilemmas caused by discrepancies between what they learn and what they see: Thinking and decision-making of preservice teachers (Report No. SP033829). Oregon: Portland State University & Pacific University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 069)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1987). NCATE standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, DC: Author.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-34.

Rosaen, C. L., & Hoekwater, E. (1990). Collaboration: Empowering educators to take charge. Contemporary Education, 61,(3), 144-151.

Sid W. Richardson Foundation. (1993). The professional development school: A commonsense approach to improving education (Report No. SP034403). Fort Worth, TX: Sid W. Richardson Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 233)

Tewel, K. J. (1989). Collaborative supervision--theory into practice. NASSP Bulletin, 73, 74-83.

Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 3-18.

Wise, A. E. (1991). We need more than a redesign. Educational Leadership, 49(3), 7.

Zeichner, K. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 296-307.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Survey of Primary School Teachers

1. A. Have you worked with a student teacher from _____ _____ in the past? Yes No

   B. If no, would you like to have a student teacher? Yes No

   C. If yes, would you like to continue working with ___ _____ student teachers? Yes No

2. A. Have you had a practicum student from _____ _____ in the past? Yes No

   B. If no, would you like to have a practicum student? Yes No

   C. If yes, would you like to continue working with ___ _____ practicum students? Yes No

3. What could the Teacher Education Division do for you individually or collectively as a faculty?

4. A. Are you Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) certified? Yes No

   B. Do you want to be TSS certified? Yes No

5. Identify, by checking, the following areas where you would like staff development or identify other areas on the blank lines.

   Cooperative Learning — Developmental Learning
   Classroom Management — Discipline
   Critical Thinking Skills

   _____
   _____
   _____

6. Are you interested in working with the professional development school concept toward the goal of making ___ _____ Primary School a professional development site? Yes No

   _____
   Signature

   (Education Division - _____ College)

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF COOPERATING TEACHER

Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher
for EDU475 Student Teaching Internship

Student's Name:_____

Directions: It is important to receive student feedback relative to competence of cooperating teachers if incompetent teachers are to be avoided in future terms. Below are listed six competency areas. Please rate your cooperating teacher's performance on a scale from a low of 1 to a high of 7. Consider all the descriptors listed below the numbered competency area as you mark the continuum.

1. THE TEACHER ORIENTED THE INTERN TO THE CLASSROOM/SCHOOL SETTING:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) clarified school policies and procedures for the intern.
(b) explained educational objectives/goals of the school, grade level, or subject area.
(c) planned the overall student teaching experience with the aid of the student teacher.
(d) clarified the role of other individuals participating in the internship (e.g., principal, superintendent, other teachers, coordinator).

2. THE TEACHER PLANNED FOR WORKING WITH THE STUDENT TEACHER:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) prepared the children/young people for the arrival of the student teacher prior to actual arrival.
(b) provided space and materials for the convenience of the intern.
(c) planned some specific initial activities for the intern during the observational/break-in period.
(d) enlisted the aid of the principal and other teachers as a part of the supervisory process.
(e) reflected knowledge and understanding of a typical teacher education program, the function of clinical field experiences, and the roles of individuals involved in the internship.

EDU475 Cooperating Teacher Evaluation 2

3. THE TEACHER GUIDED THE INTERN IN HER PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) made available and demonstrated use of example lesson plans.
(b) demonstrated to the intern the purpose and use of instructional objectives/goals.
(c) planned with the intern for implementation of day-to-day objectives and activities.
(d) showed the intern how to plan for and select instructional materials/media and other equipment.
(e) illustrated planning of different teaching methods.
(f) shared examples of educational and community resources appropriate to the grade level/content area.
(g) explained and demonstrated the use of materials/equipment based upon recent educational trends (e.g., computers).
(h) demonstrated to the intern the design, administration and interpretation of tests as a basis for planning.

4. THE TEACHER UTILIZED COMMUNICATION SKILLS APPROPRIATE TO THE COOPERATING TEACHER/STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) built a climate for effective communication.
(b) facilitated communication through clarification, demonstration, and explanation of curriculum, methods, goals, etc.
(c) encouraged clarity in intern communication with learners.
(d) listened to the intern.

5. THE TEACHER CONDUCTED FORMAL (SIT-DOWN) CONFERENCES WITH THE INTERN:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) developed a schedule for conferences on a regular basis.
(b) provided a conference setting free from disturbances.
(c) held conferences frequently enough to insure effectiveness.
(d) planned the conference around the needs/concerns of the intern.
(e) encouraged the intern to raise concerns/problems.
(f) helped the intern summarize each conference (e.g., keep a written record, etc.).

6. THE TEACHER EVALUATED THE PROGRESS OF THE INTERN:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) objectively observed intern's performance and provided feedback (written checklists) on performance.
(b) objectively observed performance and provided oral feedback on performance.
(c) helped the intern analyze his or her performance.
(d) completed the mid-term assessment form with little or no prompting by the intern.
(e) cooperatively identified intern strengths and weaknesses, suggested remediation when such was indicated.
(f) worked with the intern in preparation for the new teacher assessment process.
(g) completed the final assessment for intern with little or no prompting from the intern.

(Education Division - _____ College)

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR

EDU475 Student Teacher Internship

Evaluation of the College Supervisor

Student:_____

Directions: It is important that the Education Division receive feedback relative to the competence of college supervisors of internships and practicums. Please rate your supervisor's performance in each specific area on a scale from a low of 1 to a high of 7. Consider all the listed descriptors as you make a decision for each competency area.

1. THE COORDINATOR ORIENTED THE INTERN TO THE REQUIREMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENT TEACHING:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) reviewed the student teaching handbook with interns.
(b) explained procedures to follow in making weekly reports and in submitting mid-term and final evaluations.
(c) provided copies of needed lesson plan forms, etc. to interns.
(d) outlined his or her supervisory procedures in detail.

2. THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR COMPLETED VISITATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF STUDENT INTERN PERFORMANCE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:

(a) visited the school during the first 5 to 8 days of the quarter to make arrangements for observations.
(b) held a conference with the cooperating teacher at least twice about the intern's progress.
(c) observed the intern a minimum of three times during the term.
(d) spent at least one class period in the classroom during the three observations.
(e) gave the intern specific written and/or oral feedback after at least two formal observations.
(f) showed flexibility in scheduling visits.

EDU475 Evaluation of College Supervisor 2

3. THE SUPERVISOR CONDUCTED CONFERENCES WITH THE INTERN:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:
(a) provided feedback after at least two observations for intern's analysis and questions.
(b) discussed specific strengths and weaknesses observed.
(c) made specific suggestions for remediation of weaknesses.
(d) explained his or her system of intern evaluation.
(e) showed interest and concern for intern's situation.

4. THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR CONDUCTED PERIODIC SEMINARS FOR INTERNS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:
(a) oriented the intern to requirements and expectations for successful completion of the internship.
(b) discussed the procedures for filing the Fifth Day Report and the various weekly reports.
(c) kept the intern informed of all requirements for filing an application for a _____ certificate to teach including directions in filling out the form.

5. THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR UTILIZED INNOVATIVE TECHNIQUES OR PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING INTERN'S PERFORMANCE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low			Average			High

descriptors:
(a) used audio and/or video recorders to measure student intern performance.
(b) provided feedback to intern from the audio/video recording of intern performance.
(c) offered to obtain services of the principal, a teacher support specialist, or other personnel in evaluating the intern's performance.

ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY THE INTERN:

(Education Division - _____ College)

APPENDIX D

PDS MISSION STATEMENT AND GOALS

MISSION STATEMENT

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL

The mission of the Professional Development School (PDS) is to bring practicing teachers and administrators together with college faculty in a partnership that improves teaching and learning on the part of their respective students. This partnership will provide superior opportunities for teachers and administrators to influence the development of their profession and for college faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work through (a) mutual deliberation on problems with student learning and their possible solutions, (b) shared teaching in the college and schools, (c) collaborative research on the problems of educational practice, and (d) cooperative supervision of prospective teachers.

The PDS partnership will also provide preservice teachers with the opportunity to link theory with practice and the opportunity to experience teaching and learning within the "real world" environment. These experiences will have the capacity to provide the best possible learning environment for teacher preparation.

The PDS partnership will give primary school faculty the opportunity to (a) increase their proficiencies as supervisors, (b) increase their own repertoire of teaching skills, (c) influence the development of their own profession, and (d) experience collaboration between the college and school.

As a result of the partnership, students at the primary school will be provided a learning environment which will allow them to develop to their fullest potential and, through observing teachers and administrators as learners, they will develop the concept that learning is a lifelong venture.

(This statement includes statements from the Holmes Group Report of 1986.)

GOALS FOR THE PDS

1. To provide preservice teachers with a variety of realistic, high quality field experiences

2. To increase cooperating teachers' proficiencies as supervisors/mentors of preservice teachers

3. To provide all primary school faculty with the opportunity to increase their repertoire of teaching skills and with opportunities to enhance their professional growth

4. To increase collaboration between the college and school